



1  
2 On February 5, 2003, Appellant filed exceptions with the Personnel Appeals Board claiming that  
3 his position should be allocated to Construction Assistant or Control Technician.  
4

5 **Summary of Appellant's Argument.** Appellant claims that his duties far exceed the duties of the  
6 Maintenance Mechanic in complexity and responsibility. Appellant asserts that the University of  
7 Washington is a major consumer of water, has engaged in an incredible amount of construction in  
8 the last 10 years, and that the projects always affect the irrigation systems and require new  
9 landscaping. Appellant contends that he has overall responsibility for irrigation projects and is  
10 involved in major construction projects from the beginning of design through warranty work.  
11 Appellant claims that this work is consistent with a capital major project. Therefore, Appellant  
12 asserts that, on a best-fit basis, the Construction Assistant is the correct class in light of the scope  
13 and complexity of his responsibilities and duties. Appellant also argues that in the alternative, the  
14 Control Technician I classification is also appropriate in a best-fit basis. Appellant argues that the  
15 Maintenance Mechanic I is totally inappropriate because only 20 percent of his duties comprise  
16 maintenance work.  
17

18 **Summary of Respondent's Argument.** Respondent argues that the Construction Assistant class  
19 does not fit because Appellant's duties entail maintaining and servicing a complex, partially  
20 computerized sprinkler system, not performing site or construction inspections or coordinating  
21 construction projects. Respondent asserts that the Control Technician class is also not appropriate  
22 here because the class is restricted to positions with duties relating to maintenance of mechanical,  
23 pneumatic, electronic and electron controls for heating, air-conditioning (HVAC) and related  
24 equipment. Respondent argues Appellant works with sprinklers and sprinkler related equipment,  
25 and he employs electrical skills and knowledge related to the controls of the Rain Master  
26 computerized sprinkler system and water conservation needs. Respondent acknowledges that no

1 one class is a perfect fit for the duties performed by Appellant. Respondent also recognizes that  
2 some of Appellant's duties are beyond the Sprinkler Maintenance Worker class but argues that on a  
3 best-fit basis, the Maintenance Mechanic 1 is the appropriate classification in light of the available  
4 classes.

5  
6 **Primary Issue.** Whether the Department of Personnel correctly concluded that Appellant's  
7 position is properly allocated to the Sprinkler Maintenance Worker class.

8  
9 **Relevant Classifications.** Sprinkler Maintenance Worker (class code 5463); Maintenance  
10 Mechanic I (class code 5242); Construction Assistant (class code 4683); and Control Technician  
11 (class code 5335).

12  
13 **Decision of the Board.** The purpose of a position review is to determine which classification best  
14 describes the overall duties and responsibilities of a position. A position review is neither a  
15 measurement of the volume of work performed nor an evaluation of the expertise with which that  
16 work is performed. Also, a position review is not a comparison of work performed by employees in  
17 similar positions. A position review is a comparison of the duties and responsibilities of a particular  
18 position to the available classification specifications. This review results in a determination of the  
19 class that best describes the overall duties and responsibilities of the position. Liddle-Stamper v.  
20 Washington State University, PAB Case No. 3722-A2 (1994).

21  
22 Appellant works in the Outside Zone of Plant Services. He reports to the Grounds Supervisor in the  
23 Grounds Maintenance Department. Appellant and his coworker serve the irrigation and water  
24 conservation needs of the University of Washington campus. Appellant spends 45 percent of his  
25 time working on irrigation projects, including reviewing, advising, consulting, inspecting and  
26 providing in-field support during the project.

1  
2 Appellant spends 20 percent of his work time performing maintenance/preventative maintenance to  
3 all irrigation-related parts and equipment, including tasks such as installing, testing,  
4 troubleshooting, repairing, and relocating sprinklers. Appellant's remaining time is spent working  
5 on the irrigation central control system, providing irrigation/water conservation training, performing  
6 administrative work in support of irrigation operations, planning long-term work assignments,  
7 researching and developing irrigation training and working with the Seattle Public Utilities district.

8  
9 In the absence of a classification specification that clearly describes the exact nature of Appellant's  
10 work, we must identify the classification that most closely addresses the scope, range of duties and  
11 skills Appellant performs. To determine the class which best describes the overall duties and  
12 responsibilities of Appellant's position, we have considered all relevant classifications, including  
13 Construction Assistant, Control Technician, Maintenance Mechanic and Sprinkler Maintenance  
14 Worker.

15  
16 Appellant has failed to meet his burden of proving that either the Construction Assistant or Control  
17 Technician classes are more appropriate classes for the work he performs. The Control Technician  
18 class requires performing skilled work on HVAC systems, and Appellant clearly does not inspect,  
19 test, service or maintain heating or air-conditioning equipment. The Class Series for the  
20 Construction Assistant class requires the employee to perform site or construction inspections and  
21 coordinate the construction phase of building construction, renovation and utility projects from  
22 beginning through warranty. Appellant does not perform site, construction inspections or  
23 coordinate the construction phase of a building, renovation or utility project.

24  
25 The Sprinkler Maintenance Work class requires the employee to perform duties involving sprinkler  
26 irrigation and maintenance in a comprehensive maintenance program. Typical work includes

1 installing, maintaining, repairing and adjusting various sprinkler systems and control devices;  
2 inspecting and repairing sprinkler systems; and reviewing sprinkler system maps. Appellant  
3 performs these typical duties; however, the scope of Appellant's duties and his level of  
4 responsibilities clearly go beyond the scope of duties intended in the Sprinkler Maintenance Worker  
5 class.

6  
7 The definition of the Maintenance Mechanic I classification states, "[a]ssist journeyworker and/or  
8 perform work of a semi-skilled nature in the maintenance, repair, remodeling and construction of  
9 buildings, grounds, facilities and equipment." Appellant does not assist journeyworkers; however,  
10 he performs semi-skilled work on sprinkler equipment and the computerized sprinkler system, and  
11 he possesses electrical skills. We understand the Maintenance Mechanic I class is not the perfect  
12 fit; however, in recognition of the multifaceted duties and tasks performed by Appellant, we  
13 conclude the Maintenance Mechanic I classification is the best fit under the circumstances.

14  
15 **Conclusion.** Appellant's appeal should be granted in part, and his position should be reallocated to  
16 the Maintenance Mechanic I classification.

17  
18 ///

19 ///

20 ....

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

**ORDER**

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the appeal of Brian Davis is granted in part, the Director’s determination is reversed, and Appellant’s position is reallocated to the class of Maintenance Mechanic I.

DATED this \_\_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 2003.

**WASHINGTON STATE PERSONNEL APPEALS BOARD**

\_\_\_\_\_  
Walter T. Hubbard, Chair

\_\_\_\_\_  
Gerald L. Morgen, Vice Chair

\_\_\_\_\_  
Busse Nutley, Member